Dewan.—Do you want full Makkathayam, *i. e.*, would you exclude daughters who, under the Hindu Law, do not inherit except to a limited extent?

Member.—These are details which could be settled when the Bill is drafted.

The Member then quoted the opinion expressed by eminent men to the effect that Marumakkathayam was injurious to the community and prayed that the law might be amended as suggested by him.

Mr. T. S. Madhavan Pillai (Member, T. I. C., Changanachery) said that the Karnavan had no responsibility in educating the minor members of the tarwad even where the income admitted of expenditure in such useful directions. Under Section 10 of the Nair Regulation, the wife and minor children were entitled to maintenance, but they could not now *claim* it from the tarwad property. The provision was thus inoperative. He therefore prayed that the Regulation might be amended so as to allow individual partition. The Member added that he did not want Makkathayam.

Dewan's reply.—Noted.

37. Desirability of allowing individual partition to a Nair tarwad when there is no female member surviving.

Mr. P. Krishna Pillai (Member, Eraniel taluk) said that his proposal was that, when there were no female members in a tarwad, the male members should have the liberty by law to partition the property among them. If any of the latter were to die before partition, his share should go to his wife and children. If partition was not made, the wife and children of the last surviving member alone would inherit the whole property. Replying to the Dewan, the Member said that he was not in favour of general partition and that his scheme did not include cases in which the last surviving members included one or more females past the age of child-bearing.

Dewan's reply.—Noted.

38. Repeal of the Canals and Ferries Regulation.

Mr. Ouseph Chacko (Member, Ambalapuzha taluk) dwelt at length on the difficulties of the ryots of Kuttanad as the land was wholly under water during the greater part of the year. The use of boats was an inevitable necessity with them to allow them to move about from house to house. Each individual therefore possessed one small boat. In the cultivation season necessaries of life were transported in a boat. The children went to the school every day in a boat. Water for drinking purposes was brought in a boat. Under such circumstances, he compared the necessity for registering their boats to that of registering the feet of persons in other parts of the State, on the ground that they used them for moving about.

The Canals and Ferries Regulation had not its parallel in the Codes of other States. The necessity for such a law in Travancore was not evident. The Regulation had its operation only on the main waterway that stretched right across from the orthernmost extremity of Travancore to the confines of Trivandrum in the south nd on the approaches to most of the important towns of the State. About 90% of those waterways was the gift of nature and the outlay on the remaining portion was insignificant when compared with the cost of construction and maintenance of public roads in other parts of the State. The damage done to a waterway by the plying of boats was comparatively *nil*. The revenue derived by the Government under the Regulation was very small and was out of all proportion to the worry and trouble caused to the people. The tax on *valloms* could not be easily collected, the cost of collection was not low, the tax was not definite and capable of easy verification; in fact every canon of taxation was violated by the impost. He urged that the Regulation itself was unworkable. The exemption allowed in favour of private boats had no material advantages. The boundary line between private boats and boats plying for hire was indistinguishable and depended mainly on the discretion of the authorities. He next dealt with the difficulties of the free pass system and quoted instances in which the working of the system turned out to be detrimental to the interests of

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly